

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed May 4, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Final Office Action of May 4, 2005, the Examiner has rejected previously presented claims 16-21 and pending claims 35 and 37 as being unpatentable over Ko, et al. in view of Rothermel, et al. The Examiner has rejected previously presented claims 22-25 as being unpatentable over Ko, et al. in view of Rothermel, et al. and in further view of Teng. The Examiner has rejected previously presented claims 26-28 and 36 as being unpatentable over Ko, et al. in view of Rothermel et al. and in view of Teng and further in view of Cromer et al. The Examiner has withdrawn previously presented claims 29, 30-32, 33, and 34 as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-28 and 35-37 and the Examiner's withdrawal of claims 29-34.

Applicant respectfully asserts that both Ko and Rothermel are very broad in their discussions of network security. Ko, et al. states only that it monitors activity and then lists the different intrusion detection and response capabilities as being construed from a host-based intrusion detection system (IDS), a network sniffer, a firewall or a wrapper that intercepts the arguments of system calls; none of which track and report the contents of system files as does the present Application. Further, neither Ko, et al. nor Rothermel et al. make any suggestions that would lead one skilled in the art to reach Applicant's claimed invention based on the contents of these references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner find independent claims 16, 35, and 37 and all claims depending therefrom patentable.

In view of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the section 103 rejection and allow claims 16-28, 35, and 37 as currently presented. Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration of the above.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 16-28 and 35-37.

Should the Examiner have any questions or desire clarification of any sort, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below. Please reference Attorney Docket No. SIDR001US0.

Respectfully submitted,

By: //William N. Hulsey III, Reg. No. 33,402//  
William N. Hulsey III  
Reg. No. 33,402

Dated: July 5, 2005

William N. Hulsey III  
Hulsey<sup>IP</sup> Intellectual Property Attorneys, P.C.  
1250 S. Capital of Texas Hwy.  
Building Three, Suite 610  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 795-1295 [Telephone]  
(512) 233-2602 [Fax]